



CRM-M No. 33694 of 2025 1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

102

CRM-M No. 33694 of 2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 04.07.2025

Mandeep Singh @ Goli

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU**Present:** Mr. Amarjeet Singh Prajapati, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Mohit Kapoor, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.**CRM-24813-2025**

Application under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for placing on record Annexures P-3 & P-4 in pen drive mode.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, same is allowed as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions. P-3 and P-4 are taken on record.

Registry to tag the same at appropriate place.

Main Case

Present petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS'), for grant of pre-arrest bail to the petitioner in FIR No.78 dated 02.05.2025 (P-1), under Sections 115(2), 118(1), 324(4), 351(3), 333 & 191(3) read with Section 190 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS') [Sections 117(2) & 109 of BNS added later on], registered at Police Station, Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala.

2. Allegations are that petitioner along with other co-accused

**CRM-M No. 33694 of 2025 2**

formed an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of their common object, inflicted injuries on the person of complainant party with respective weapons having intention to kill.

3. While making reference to Annexures P-3 and P-4, specifically contends that version in the FIR by *de facto* complainant-Vishavjot Singh is completely manipulated, as the same is running *de hors* the aforesaid documents (P-3 & P-4). Also contends that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and ready to join investigation, but he be protected.

4. *Per contra*, learned State counsel vehemently opposed the prayer while submitting that allegations against the petitioner are serious in nature; he has specifically been attributed the head injury caused with an iron rod having intention to kill the complainant and the same is declared as grievous in nature. Further submits that in view of the gravity of offence, petitioner does not deserve the concession of pre-arrest bail. Lastly submits that in case petitioner is released on pre-arrest bail, there is every likelihood of interfering with fair investigation.

5. Heard learned counsel for both the sides and perused the paper book.

6. There is no quarrel that petitioner has been named in the FIR. Even from perusal of the MLR, head injury attributed to the petitioner with an iron rod is opined to be grievous in nature; therefore, *prima facie*, his complicity in the alleged crime is well apparent.

7. Hence, in such a scenario, custodial interrogation of petitioner would be very much necessary to recover the alleged weapon of offence used during occurrence and to know true facts of the case.

8. Consequently, there is no option, except to dismiss the petition.



CRM-M No. 33694 of 2025 3

- 9. Ordered accordingly.
- 10. Needless to say that above observations be not construed as an expression of opinion on merits of allegations, in any manner.

Pending application(s), if any shall also stands disposed off.

04.07.2025

Rajeev (rvs)/SN

**(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No